

Reed Stabbed Party in Back; Now Unrepentant, Would Lead

Charles M. Hay, in Speech at Sikeston, Charges Reed Betrayed Party in 1920.

The Most Eloquent Democrat in Missouri Pleads for Nomination of Long to U. S. Senate. Discusses Campaign Issue.

Sikeston, Mo.—Charles M. Hay, of St. Louis, concluded his three-day tour of Southeast Missouri with an address here today. As in previous talks, Hay devoted himself largely to the public record of Senator James A. Reed. He asserted Reed had employed the tactics of the jungle in his dealings with Woodrow Wilson, and charged him with betrayal of the Democratic party in Missouri and the nation.

Hay pledged his steadfast support to Breckinridge Long, who is opposing Reed for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator, subject to the State-wide primary election on August 1. Long, he said, represents a positive, constructive force, promising great usefulness to his constituents, if sent to Washington, while Reed's record is an undeviating trail of criticism, obstruction and opposition.

Hay's speech was filled with eloquent passages, which aroused his hearers to great enthusiasm. His tributes to the Missouri farmer, to the service men and to Woodrow Wilson were especially noteworthy. He spoke in part as follows:

REED'S RECORD REVIEWED.

"Reed has ability; talent—but can that talent be trusted? What is the answer in his senatorial career? He entered the Senate in 1910 with these words still ringing in the ears of his constituents:

"I have never given aid or comfort to the enemy. I have not claimed to be wiser than the combined wisdom of my party as expressed in its platform regularly adopted."

"Have his acts squared with his words?"

"Let his record before the war, during the war and since the war, answer:

"In 1912 a Democratic administration came into power. With a fidelity and vision unsurpassed in our history it set itself to the accomplishment of long-deferred reforms.

What was the contribution of James A. Reed to his party and his country during that period?"

"Criticism, obstruction, opposition."

"In 1914 the President recommended certain needed changes in the Interstate Commerce Commission law. Reed opposed the measure. In the same year the President proposed amendments to the anti-trust laws. Reed opposed the measure after it had been agreed upon in conference.

"The Federal Reserve Bank Act, he, at first, attacked with a ferocity that brought consternation to its friends. He seemed determined to defeat it. Finding that impossible, and yielding for once to party pressure, he was, to use the language of Carter Glass of Virginia, 'finally whipped into line.' But to accomplish this a personal appeal to the great President, who was laying out his very life for the measure, was necessary. It was then he wrote the letter which eight years later Reed has the temerity to submit as his certificate of character as a Democrat and public servant.

RECORD IN WAR TIME.

"So reads his record before the war. War came. What was Reed's contribution to his party and his country during the war? Again the record answers—criticism, obstruction, opposition. He voted for the war. But he opposed the measures necessary to win the war. With his nation at war, practically without an army, he opposed the service act, designed to secure an army and secure it on the Jeffersonian principle that 'all men are created equal.' With an army called for, which had to be fed, he opposed the food control act, designed to secure food and secure it in fair and equitable terms. If he had voted against the war, he

could not have pleased the Kaiser more.

"But, thank God, he didn't have his way. He didn't ham-string America or enable Germany to win. The forces of constructive statesmanship couldn't whip him in line, but they brushed him aside and marched on. Not only the statesmen from Missouri, but the boys from Missouri marched on. They answered their country's call with a dare, they sailed the seas with a song, they went over the top with a smile. They marched on through blood and fire, on the front, till that November morning when beneath the stars of their God and their country, they stood triumphant over the broken remnants of German autocracy. Of them and their record, we're proud. We're proud of the record made by fathers and mothers, wives and daughters who stayed at home and worked and saved, prayed and sacrificed that these boys might be fed and clothed, armed and munitioned, and that America might win the war. The paths of Missouri's young manhood run from homes to dug-outs, and from furrows of the farm to the trenches of the battle front. These paths are lit by the altar fires of sacrifice and patriotism. Would God those were the only ones made by Missourians. But winding amidst them like the tortuous trail of the hissing serpent is the path made by the senior Senator from Missouri.

"But we didn't follow him. He made that slimy trail alone. It is my faith that we won't crawl in it now. We will set up but one stone to mark it, which will bear this superscription:

"Erected in honor of Missouri Democrats who repudiated the man that made these tracks."

HOOVER NOT AN ISSUE

"With the odor of that trail about him, this man of boasted courage comes to Missouri. But as he looks back on his war record, he hasn't the nerve to submit it to Missouri Democrats for their approval or disapproval. Instead of that, he speaks to divert attention to the record of another man—as if he were a candidate against him. Instead of defending his own record, he denounces the alleged record of Herbert Hoover. But let Mr. Reed understand. The gentleman whose record we're interested in is not named Herbert Hoover, but James A. Reed. We do not care, just now, who Hoover is, or what he is or was. If he is a devil, that doesn't make Jim Reed a saint. Reed can't put wings on himself by putting horns and hoofs on Hoover.

"But by his discussion of Hoover, Reed has only added to his own dishonor, for he has deliberately falsified about Hoover and attempted to deceive you, his own constituents. He tells you that Hoover fixed the price of wheat. That's not true. A commission of twelve men, six representing the farming industry, fixed it, and Hoover had nothing to do with it.

"He says that Hoover fixed the price under the then market prices, and that as soon as his control ended the price advanced. That's not true. On the day the price was fixed at \$2.20 per bushel, the market price ranged from \$2.16 to 2.26 per bushel. On the day the food control period expired, June 1, 1920, the price of cash wheat on the Chicago market was \$2.75. On July 15, when speculation in futures was resumed, it was \$2.84. On July 21, it was \$2.45. On August 15 it was \$2.53; on September 1, \$2.58; on September 15, \$2.66; on September 30, \$2.45; on November 1, \$2.16, on December 1, \$2.16, and on December 1, \$1.86.

"We find, therefore, that within six months after food control ended

the price had declined 89c per bushel. What is the price now? What has it been since? By what rule, therefore, can it be calculated that Hoover deprived the American farmers of a billion dollars? By the token of actual figures I say that if Hoover was responsible for the prices farmers enjoyed in war times, the daily prayer of the American farmers now should be: 'Oh, Lord, give us more of Hoover and less of Harding.'

TRIBUTE TO THE FARMER.

"But Reed says Hoover kept the American farmer from getting perhaps \$10 per bushel for his wheat. If he means by that to charge that the American farmer complains because he didn't get \$10 per bushel, I resent it as a slander of the American farmer. I was born and reared on a farm. My father and mother sleep in the country graveyard hard by the farm their hands had cleared and tilled, and on which they lived and loved and died. My kinsmen are farmers. I own a farm myself. And I think I know something of the loyalty and patriotism of the American farmer. I have seen him as he wooed and won and loved and lost. I have seen him as, with radiant eyes, he stood by the newborn babe, and again as he dropped the last tear on a new-made grave. I have seen him at dawn go whistling afield to wring from Mother Earth a sustenance for his flock and a contribution to the hungry world. I have seen him at the end of the day as he gathered his family about him to invoke the guidance and protection of a beneficent God. I have seen him through the eyes of the barefoot country school boy. I saw him yonder at Lexington as embattled he 'fired the shot heard around the world.' I saw him by the flickering fires of Valley Forge, as he knelt in the snow by his Washington. I saw him with Daniel Boone on the wild frontier blazing the paths of civilization.

"I saw him at Gettysburg as, led by his Mead or Lee, he died without a murmur for the cause he loved. I saw him at Appomattox turn south, all lost save honor, to build again amid the ashes of his hopes, or turn north to discharge the stern tasks of peace with the same courage he exemplified in war. I have seen him since in times of peace, felling the forests, draining the swamps, carpeting hills and valleys with velvet and with gold—and all by honest toil. I saw him without a murmur send forth his sons to do and dare and die for the democracy he loves.

"And having so seen and so known him, I resent the imputation of James A. Reed that the American farmer in Missouri wanted \$10 per bushel for his wheat in time of war, as a base and infamous slander.

SEEKS PEACE WITH VETERANS.

"In this belated hour he tries to make peace with the service men by a mock concern for their welfare. He opposed the measure designed to insure them bread in wartime, but he wants to give them a bonus now. But it will be observed that he wants his bonus first. While the bonus bill waits in Washington, he campaigns for renomination in Missouri. Breckinridge Long was for bread then and is for a bonus now. I would rather trust him to keep up the fight for a bonus than the man who jeopardized the soldiers' bread in time of war.

"Such is Reed's record on war.

"The war ended. The problems of peace arise. What contribution to their solution was made by James A. Reed? Again the record answers: 'Criticism, obstruction, opposition.'

"With the end of the war arose a cry from all the world for some plan to preserve peace. In answer to that yearning of mankind, the peace conference prepared the covenant of the League of Nations. By unanimous vote they adopted it, and submitted it to the nations. It was submitted to our country by the great man who led in framing it. He urged the Senate to accept it, not as a perfect plan, but as the best then obtainable. The majority of his party and great leaders of the opposing party approved it. Citizens everywhere—Democrats in overwhelming numbers, called upon their representatives to ratify the treaty.

"What was the record of James A. Reed? Criticism, obstruction, opposition. He opposed it. He denounced it. He attacked the good faith and patriotism of the President for advising its ratification. He not only fought the treaty, but he fought it unfairly. He didn't state the facts. He deliberately misstated them. He didn't fight it honestly. He deliberately misconstrued the plain terms of the covenant. He resorted to base sophistry and demagoguery to deceive the people. He stooped to coarse appeals to passion and prejudice to inflame the people against the treaty and the treaty's supporters.

VILLIFICATION OF WILSON.

"The cruel fact is that this man, who in 1910 boasted that he had never stabbed his party's leaders in the back, not only denounced the President's proposal, but vilified him personally. Not only in the Senate, but from one end of the country to the other, he attacked him with the coarseness of the gutter and the ferocity of the jungle. The attacks began as the President took his seat at the conference table, continued as the President, single-handed and alone, battled for justice and democracy against old world diplomats, increased in ferocity as he returned to his native shores with the great document in his hand, raged unabated as the President, pleading for the great cause, paled and trembled and fell; pursued him to the sick-chamber and there with eager, savage eyes, kept watch with Death itself.

"At Salisbury, Mo., he referred to the President as a 'long-eared animal that goes braying about the country.' When confronted by that statement in this campaign, he at first denied it. When men of unimpeachable veracity swore that he made it, he admitted it, and then, he says (mark his words) immediately withdrew it. In other words, he stabbed the President in the back and immediately drew the dagger out. Would God that the daggers thrust in the back of Woodrow Wilson could be withdrawn! But they stabbed him; they let his blood; they weakened him; they broke his nerve. They broke his heart. They, for the time, defeated his plan for his country and humankind. And now called to answer for their crimes, they hold up their bloody hands and whine—'Forgive, forgive; I pulled the dagger out as soon as I stuck it in.'

"During Reed's bitter fight on the peace treaty, individual Democrats, organizations of Democrats, the Democratic State committee, Democratic members of the Missouri General Assembly appealed to him to support it. To each and all his answer was that the Democratic party had never made a platform declaration on the treaty and that he was answerable only to a regularly constituted Democratic convention.

"In April, 1920 a regularly constituted convention met at Joplin. The delegates were selected with an eye single to the approval or disapproval of the league covenant and of Reed's attitude thereon. The convention by an overwhelming vote declared in favor of the treaty. But the combined wisdom of the Democracy of his State, as declared in a platform regularly adopted, did not move him then as it had moved him in 1910. In defiance of the platform, he asked an election as a district delegate to the national convention that he might there belie the platform of his party. By a vote of 1,070 to 429, his impudent request was denied.

TRAILED TO SAN FRANCISCO.

"Did he bow to the will of his party? No. He trailed out to San Francisco. In defiance of the will of his State's convention, he asked the credentials committee for a seat in the national convention. They denied his request. Still defiant, he caused his fight to be carried to the floor of the convention. By an overwhelming vote he was rejected and repudiated. Not only so. The convention by a platform regularly and by overwhelming vote adopted, declared in favor of the peace treaty, including the league covenant. What then? Did Reed accept the 'combined wisdom of my party'?"

"In 1910 he said: 'I stand on the Democratic platform. I never left

EDITORIAL

In every well regulated packing house there is a trained ox called Judas, who leads the other cattle to slaughter. There are some men who may be likened to the Judas ox who, in the language of the street, give their fellow beings the "bum steer" and lead them to destruction. That is what will happen if you follow Judas Jimmie, who did more than any other one man to lead the Democratic party to destruction in 1920.

it and never found it difficult to keep my equilibrium upon it.' On his return from San Francisco, did he stand on his party's platform? Did he keep his equilibrium on it? No. He never got on it at all. He says the State committee ruled him off. They couldn't roll him on. He hired a hall in Kansas City, stood on his own platform; denounced his party's platform and nominees, then hurried away to Wisconsin to speak for an independent Republican candidate for United States Senator. He says he was trying to help the Democratic nominee. I wonder what he told the Republican candidate at the time.

"HE BETRAYED THE PARTY."

"He betrayed the party. He stabbed its leaders in the back. Just as he said of David R. Francis in 1896, we say to him now. 'We are opposed to turning control of the Democratic party to men who stabbed our leaders and our organization in the back.'

"So runs his record before the war, during the war, and since the war. From beginning to end it is the same story—criticism, obstruction, opposition."

"He asks us to repudiate the Joplin, Jefferson City and San Francisco platforms, regularly adopted by Democratic conventions, and write a platform to his liking. He asks that we repudiate the outstanding achievements of the Wilson administration; Cox and Franklin and Roosevelt; that we repudiate our own votes cast in 1920.

"Are you ready to do it? If you do, then set yourselves to the task of writing a new platform for the democracy of Missouri. What will you write?"

TRIBUTE TO LONG.

"I never knew Breckinridge Long until I removed from Callaway county to St. Louis nine years ago. I knew him as a lawyer, a citizen and a Democrat before he became known throughout Missouri and the entire country. As a lawyer he was sound in judgment, unimpeachable in integrity; faithful to his clients and fair to his adversaries.

"As a Democrat he was active, consistent and persistent in the support of his party's leaders and policies. He was liberal with his time, energy and money. He did not make as much noise as some others, but his work was usually effective.

"Mr. Long was born in old Missouri. He lived in this State for over thirty years before announcing as a candidate for any office. He has been from boyhood a perennial worker for the Democratic party, but not a perennial candidate. He did not arrive in Missouri from a Republican State one day and begin running for office the next. In my humble opinion, if he were defeated for a nomination, he would not sulk in his tent. If he could not lead his way on a matter of policy, I believe he would play the game like a loyal Democrat, and not hire a hall to vent his spleen on his party, and then hurry off to another State and make speeches for a Republican candidate.

"Two years ago when I was a candidate against Long, I watched him with all the eagerness and solicitude with which one candidate observes another. I said at the close of that campaign what I am gratified to say

now, namely: that while he prosecuted his campaign with vigor, he was at all times and under all circumstances fair and honorable.

NO NEWBERRYISM BY LONG.

"It was charged that his wife had money, and it was predicted by many of my friends and the friends of other candidates that Long would make lavish use of his wife's money to secure the nomination. I presume his wife had considerable money. If so, she is fortunate, and so is he. I wish mine had. But if Breckinridge Long used a single dollar in the last campaign to corrupt a single voter, I never heard of it. While he may have spent considerable money, he in no sense attempted to Newberryize the State.

"He proved a popular leader in the general election, running some 10,000 votes ahead of his ticket; this notwithstanding the fact that the man who today has the effrontery to ask the party to nominate him sought by direction and indirection to encourage his friends to scratch Long.

"Long's record as a public servant is known to all. During the last Democratic administration he was assistant secretary of state. His duties were manifold; his responsibilities great. In a time of international discord and hate it was his task to make friends for his country. It has been asserted that his chief function was to entertain representatives of foreign countries. That was one of his duties, and he it said to his honor, he entertained in such a way as to send the representatives home with a deeper friendship for America and Americans. While Breckinridge Long was devoting his time, talent and means to the entertainment of America's friends, his opponent in this race was prostituting his talents to the delight and comfort of America's enemies.

"With the taint of that course still upon him, he now attempts with ridicule and sarcasm to belittle Long's services. He says, forsooth, that Long's chief function was carrying alligator grips for foreign diplomats. That doubtless is a minor role, but frankly I would rather carry alligator grips for the friends and guests of my country than by word and act to lend aid and comfort to my country's enemies.

COCKTAILS AND POISON.

"He says Long mixed cocktails for effete English dukes. Maybe so, but he never mixed any poison in the cup of the president of his country in time of war.

"He says again that Long lived and entertained at great expense in a mansion at Washington. That may be so, but so far as I have learned, his entertaining, whether of foreign diplomats or American citizens, was in furtherance of his country's cause in peace and in war.

"Reed says that for entertainment purposes, Long has in his cellar or cellars a liberal supply of Old Lynch Rye and other familiar brands. Personally, I do not know, and so far as this race is concerned, I do not care whether that charge is true or false. Whether Breckinridge Long is as wet as a fish or as dry as a camel, I am for him.

"If he be wet, he is a 'wet' Democrat, and as between a 'wet' Democrat and a 'wet' Republican man-

(Continued on Page Four.)